

Measure of Autocorrelation Times of Local Hybrid Monte Carlo Algorithm for Lattice QCD

Paolo Marenzoni
Luigi Pagnetti
Dipartimento di Fisica
Università di Parma,
Viale delle Scienze
I-43100 Parma
Italy

Pietro Rossi
CRS4
Via Nazario Sauro, 10
I-09123 Cagliari
Italy

Abstract

We report on a study of the autocorrelation times of the local version of the Hybrid Monte Carlo (LHMC) algorithm for pure gauge $SU(3)$. We compare LHMC to standard multi-hit Metropolis and to the global version of the same HMC. For every algorithm we measure the autocorrelation time (τ) for a variety of observables and the string tension (σ) as a function of β . The measurements performed on 8^4 and 16^4 lattices indicate that the autocorrelation time of LHMC is significantly shorter than for the other two algorithms.

Introduction

In order to extract a meaningful number from a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation we have to associate a realistic error estimate to the measurement of the mean value. The ability of obtaining a good value for the error depends on our knowledge of the number of statistical independent samples that we have, which in turn implies a knowledge of the autocorrelation time τ associated to the chosen algorithm.

In lattice QCD, as we approach the continuum limit ($a \rightarrow 0$, or $\beta \rightarrow \infty$) we observe the well known phenomenon of critical slowing down. This means that, as $a \rightarrow 0$, τ tends to diverge, thus requiring more and more iterations of a given algorithm to obtain an independent configuration. The approach to the continuum limit implies that the autocorrelation length of the system is diverging, or the lowest mass, expressed in lattice units is diverging. For a given lattice, a numerical simulation will be meaningful only if we limit ourselves to values of the coupling constant corresponding to correlation length significantly shorter than the lattice size, so for a given lattice the critical slowing down can be described by a critical exponent z parameterizing the dependence of τ on the typical mass scale, $\tau = \alpha m^{-z}$.

In chapter 1 we give a brief overview of the HMC algorithm and the LHMC version, chapter two contains a description of the measurement of the autocorrelation time, chapter three describes in details the measurement performed, including a discussion on the choice of the optimal trajectory length. Results are presented and commented in chapter four.

1 Hybrid Monte Carlo

The HMC algorithm is one of a variety of Monte Carlo techniques to simulate statistical systems described by some local action [1].

We will concentrate on lattice gauge theories, therefore the action we are talking about is the usual Wilson's action,

$$S_p = \sum_{x,\mu,\nu} \beta [1 - \frac{1}{3} \text{ReTr}(U_\mu(n)U_\nu(n+\mu)U_{-\mu}(n+\mu+\nu)U_{-\nu}(n+\nu))]. \quad (1)$$

The HMC prescription dictates to introduce fictitious conjugate momenta π for every degree of freedom, and simulate the pseudo-Hamiltonian

$$H(\pi, U) = Tr\pi_\mu^2(x) + S_p(U). \quad (2)$$

The simulation begins by generating the momenta π 's distributed according to the Gaussian:

$$P(\pi) = exp\left(\sum_{x,\mu} Tr\pi_\mu^2(x)\right), \quad (3)$$

then, starting from the randomly chosen momenta and the current U 's a new set of π 's and U 's are chosen as the end point of the trajectory generated by integrating Hamilton's equation of motion associated to the Hamiltonian (2).

At the end of the trajectory, the small variation in energy introduced by the finite step size is corrected by a Metropolis-like step.

All the details on this algorithm can be found in [1] [2]. The key point to observe is that, since all the degrees of freedom are evolved simultaneously, in order to preserve detailed balance, the Metropolis step must be applied to the whole lattice. This step consists in comparing the difference between the initial and the final value of the energy

$$\delta H = H_{new} - H_{old} \quad (4)$$

and the probability of accepting the new configuration is proportional to

$$P \approx e^{-\delta H}. \quad (5)$$

δH is an extensive quantity and it will grow with some power of the volume. In turn, this implies that, in order to keep the acceptance constant, the step size will have to be reduced according to the same volume's law.

1.1 Local Hybrid Monte Carlo

Let us denote with U_E the gauge field variables sitting at even sites of the lattice and U_O those sitting at odd sites. The stochastic matrix describing the updating from the old variables

(U_E, U_O) to the new variables $(\overline{U_E}, \overline{U_O})$ will be denoted by:

$$W(\overline{U_E}, \overline{U_O}; U_E, U_O). \quad (6)$$

If we choose to update even sites first, then odd sites, this stochastic matrix factorizes in

$$W(\overline{U_E}, \overline{U_O}; \overline{U_E}, U_O) W(\overline{U_E}, U_O; U_E, U_O). \quad (7)$$

Since the Wilson action only involves nearest neighbor interactions, even sites are totally independent, so are odd ones and, as a result, each one of the factors of the above equation factorizes. For instance:

$$W(\overline{U_E}, U_O; U_E, U_O) = \prod_{x \in E} W(\overline{U_x}, U_O; U_x, U_O). \quad (8)$$

Parallelism can be achieved easily by applying simultaneously all the elemental stochastic matrices to one checkerboard at a time. For each variable then, we apply the HMC scheme and the final Metropolis acceptance-rejection test only involves a local modification of the action therefore there is not any degrading of the acceptance due to the volume and we can use very large step sizes.

The integration of Hamilton's equations of motion involves the computation of the force term which is made up by the staple of the link under investigation. This staple is constructed solely by links belonging to the opposite checkerboard, so the algorithm is equivalent to the integration of the equation of motion for a variable in an external field. This is, of course, another clear advantage over the conventional HMC. In the global version of HMC, at every step the staple has to be computed anew, therefore the computational cost of a trajectory is a multiple of the cost of the first step. In the local version only the first step is expensive, successive steps are only a fraction of the cost that can be estimated around 10%.

As we will see in the section devoted to the discussion of the results, the combination of these effects account for an inexpensive algorithm that moves effectively through phase space.

2 Autocorrelation times

For a set of n measures of an observable A we can define the autocorrelation function:

$$C(t) = N \sum_{i=1}^{n-|t|} < (A_i - < A >)(A_{i+t} - < A >) > \quad (9)$$

where $< A >$ is the average over all the measurements and N is a constant fixed by the condition $C(0) = 1$. If we assume that, at large times t , this function decays exponentially $C(t) \approx \exp[-t/\tau_{exp}]$, then τ_{exp} provides us with a definition of the autocorrelation time. This way to compute τ however can be affected by large errors, when τ is small.

This defines, of course, only the autocorrelation of the given observables. Different ones can in principle, and often do, have different autocorrelation times. To define the autocorrelation of a given algorithm, one should survey a complete set of observables and chose the highest τ . This, being highly non practical, is approximated by a choice of selected operators and that will, operatively, define the τ of the algorithm.

Another definition of τ is given by [3]:

$$\tau_{int} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} C(t) \quad (10)$$

However, this estimator of τ_{int} present a whole new set of troubles because when the sum over t goes to $|t| \gg \tau$ the function $C(t)$ contains noise much higher than the signal. Adding these terms we would over estimate the errors. The practical solution is a cut off in the sum in the previous equation, introducing a suitably constant M :

$$\tau_{int} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=-M}^M C(t) \quad (11)$$

In this way our calculation will be biased, since we are systematically neglecting terms in the sum (6). On the other hand we can systematically exploit that bias defining the sum extended over t 's as long as $C(t) > \frac{1}{e^q}$. Our choice is $q = 10$.

Whatever definition of τ we choose, we noticed consistently that in order to have a reliable estimate, the length of our run must be approximately 1000 times the estimated autocorrelation time.

Our τ have been measured on a large set of Wilson loop, from 1×1 to 3×3 . For these observables the behavior is not noticeably different, therefore the data shown in the following refer to the 3×3 Wilson loops.

3 Tuning of the parameters

There are two parameters characterizing HMC like algorithms, N_s and δt . It is well known that for the global HMC tuning of these parameters is crucial to improve on the autocorrelation of the algorithm. For the LHMC we have noticed that the autocorrelation time, of the monitored observables, depends very lightly on the parameters chosen. A value of $T = N_s \delta t = 1$ is nearly optimal in every case and all data shown have been obtained with T between 0.9 and 1.2, with N_s varying from 2 to 4. These values correspond to an acceptance rate around 90%.

When discussing autocorrelation times, these should be correctly given in CPU time and not sweeps but for the LHMC, as explained above, extra steps have only a marginal cost, so we give, for sake of simplicity, all the τ 's expressed in number of iterations. The same holds for multi-hit Metropolis, while in the case of global HMC, where different trajectories length have a very different cost, we limited ourselves to the fixed trajectory length of $T = 0.3$, with $N_s = 10$ [4]. All the simulations for multi-hit Metropolis were done with 8 hits per step.

4 Results

Autocorrelation times have been measured, besides for LHMC, for multi-hit Metropolis and the global HMC. In table 1 we show the autocorrelation times for the 3×3 Wilson loop on a 16^4 lattice, for all the three algorithms considered, while tables 2 and 3 concentrate on LHMC for different observables and β 's.

From the data it is obvious that LHMC decorrelates much faster when measured in terms of sweeps, and even better if measured in terms of computational cost. This concept is emphasized in table 4 where we plot the time it takes to perform a number of sweeps corresponding to one τ . For instance, at $\beta = 6.0$, if we assign, in arbitrary units, 1 to LHMC

it takes 7.4 for multi-hit Metropolis and 400 for global HMC.

Our goal was the measure of the dynamical critical exponent of the algorithm in the hope of confirming certain theoretical results obtained on the Gaussian model, claiming it to be one. This was not possible since we noticed an unexpected behavior of the τ 's. For every observables that we analyzed, we observed that, plotting τ versus the autocorrelation length (or for that matter versus β), we did not get a monotonically increasing function, as expected, but a peak at a finite value of the coupling. The position of the peak is strongly observable dependent and less strongly volume dependent. Without a monotonic behavior it is not possible to fit the τ to a power law of the correlation length and therefore extract the dynamical critical exponent of the algorithm. This unexpected behavior is not an artifact of the algorithm used, since we observe it for multi-hit metropolis as well as with global HMC, but rather a feature of the physics of lattice QCD. Some author recently, in the framework of a different algorithm [5], observing the same behavior, conjectured some connection to the finite temperature phase transition. That interpretation is not fully consistent with previously well known results, about the position of that transition. From our analysis it is not possible today to offer support for that view since it is quite puzzling that the peak moves about according to the observables. Furthermore, even for the larger Wilson loops, the position of the peak is at values of β much lower than the value observed by the above authors.

Acknowledgments

The authors warmly acknowledge useful discussions with E. Onofri. All the numerical works presented in this paper was performed on Connection Machines CM2 at the University of Parma, CM200 at CRS4 in Cagliari and CM5 at IPG in Paris. We wish to extend our thanks to the above mentioned institutions.

This research was partly supported by the Sardegna Regional Authority.

Captions

Table 1:

LHMC and Metropolis τ for the 3×3 Wilson's loop.

Table 2:

τ values for a variety of Wilson's loops.

Table 3:

Creutz's ratios.

Table 4:

Ratios of timings to cover one τ .

References

- [1] S. Duane, A.D. Kennedy, B.J. Pendleton and D. Roweth, **Phys. Lett. B195** (1987) 216.
- [2] K. Bitar and A.D. Kennedy, R. Horsley and S. Meyer, P. Rossi, **Nucl. Phys. B313** (1989) 377.
- [3] N. Madras and A.D. Sokal, **Jour. of Stat. Phys. 50** (1988) 109.
- [4] R. Gupta, G.W. Kilcup and S.R. Sharpe, **Phys. Rev. D38** (1988) 1278.
- [5] K. Akemi et al. **IPS Research Report No.92-28, HUPD-9218** (1992).

β	LHMC	Metropolis	HMC
5.6	3.93 ± 1.07	14.35 ± 1.91	36 ± 12
5.8	8.27 ± 1.32	81.36 ± 37.20	
6.0	5.57 ± 0.27	33.22 ± 15.99	
6.2	5.32 ± 1.62	15.43 ± 7.25	88 ± 50

Table 1:

β	w_{11}	w_{21}	w_{22}	w_{31}	w_{32}	w_{33}
5.4	8.14 ± 0.36					
5.6	9.56 ± 0.16	9.95 ± 0.09	9.87 ± 0.21	9.30 ± 0.50	8.42 ± 1.34	3.93 ± 1.07
5.7						7.07 ± 1.11
5.8	7.15 ± 0.26	8.59 ± 0.48	9.82 ± 0.23	8.82 ± 0.19	10.70 ± 0.47	8.27 ± 1.32
5.9						7.69 ± 0.19
6.0	2.71 ± 0.12	3.65 ± 0.86	4.13 ± 0.22	3.38 ± 0.44	5.34 ± 0.07	5.57 ± 0.27
6.2	2.36 ± 0.34	2.79 ± 0.42	3.16 ± 0.45	2.74 ± 0.34	4.01 ± 0.40	5.32 ± 1.62
6.3	2.12 ± 0.18					3.77 ± 0.29
6.43	2.58 ± 0.75					
6.5	2.21 ± 0.39					

Table 2:

β	$\chi_{2,2}$	$\chi_{3,2}$
5.6	6.73 ± 1.16	4.19 ± 0.56
5.8	6.63 ± 0.08	5.56 ± 0.61
6.0	3.09 ± 0.03	3.48 ± 0.14
6.2	2.09 ± 0.14	2.81 ± 0.48

Table 3:

β	$\frac{\tau_{Metropolis}}{\tau_{LHMC}}$	$\frac{\tau_{HMC}}{\tau_{LHMC}}$
5.6	4.6	169
5.8	12.2	
6.0	7.4	408
6.2	3.6	

Table 4: